

FILED

APR 17 2019

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia**

HILDRED M. LYLES,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-00561 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"). The Court will grant plaintiff's application to proceed IFP and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires complaints to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); *Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff, an North Carolina inmate, has filed suit against the United States. The form of the complaint, on its face, fails to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) and D.C. LCvR 5.1.

Furthermore, the pleading is incomprehensible and fails to make out any cognizable claim. It is unclear what relief, if any, plaintiff seeks.

The ambiguous and rambling allegations comprising plaintiff's pleading fail to provide adequate notice of a claim. The causes of action, if any, are completely undefined. The pleading also fails to set forth allegations with respect to this Court's jurisdiction or venue, or a valid basis for an award of damages. In fact, it is unclear what actual damages, if any, plaintiff has suffered. Therefore, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: April 16, 2019



United States District Judge